UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,404	11/22/2006	Damien Mandy	0512-1606	9106

466   7590   04/28/2011
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/531,404	MANDY, DAMIEN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AKIBA K. ROBINSON BOYCE	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/17/10

has been entered.

Status of Claims

2.   Due to communications filed 8/17/10, the following is a non-final office action.

Claims 1, 4, and 10 are amended. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application and have

been examined on the merits. The previous rejection has been adjusted to reflect claim

amendments and claims 1-12 are rejected as follows. .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as
> set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be
> patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious
> at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
> subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention
> was made.

4.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Silberberg (US 20030010821 A1), and further in view of Amirpanahi (US 5,648,906),

and further in view of Chan (US 4,861,971).

        As per claims 1, 10, Silberberg discloses:

        receiving, at the payment system, a first payment from a user corresponding to a

first authorized parking time/ a payment means wherein a user makes a first payment to

benefit from a corresponding first authorized parking time, and a second payment to

benefit from a corresponding second authorized parking time, upon said first authorized

parking time not being expired, ([0059], payment can be made by any of the other

methods previously referred to including credit card payment in which credit card details

are transmitted either automatically from the mobile phone or by the user keying

numbers into the mobile phone, or from a Smart Card or SIM Card associated with the

telephone 60 and which carries a cash balance which is reduced in accordance with the

cost of the parking); and

        supplying, by the payment system, to said user an extending code specific to

said first payment, for extending parking time/ a processing and communication means

that supplies said user an extending code specific to said first payment for

extending parking time, ([0059], and once payment has been verified by the central

station 50 the central station 50 transmits a code back to the telephone 60 which acts

as a virtual receipt to indicate that parking has been paid for, where the code also acts

as a code allowing entry into the parking station 100 when the user presents at the

parking station 100, and also discloses that payment for the time required can be

deducted from the user's account in the same manner as described with reference to

Fig. 1, where in the embodiment of Fig. 1, payment is made in order to extend parking

time as shown in [0052], thereby suggesting that the code can be used to extend

parking time since the code is directly related to payment, and payment is used to

extend parking time);

receiving, at the payment system, from said user a second payment corresponding to a

second authorized parking time upon said first authorized parking time not being

expired, ([0052], Silberberg discloses that the user can input a command by touching

any key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station

will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter

to show that additional parking time has been paid for, which occurs when the paid

parking time has almost expired);

and automatically increasing, by said payment system, said second authorized

parking time by a residual authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking

time linked to said first payment identified by said received extending code/ a

processing and input means wherein said user, upon making said second payment,

enters said extending code of said first payment so as to increase said second

authorized parking time by a remaining authorized parking time corresponding

to said first authorized parking time, however does disclose a payment option where the

user uses his telephone number to dial the central station and the users account

number is automatically deduced from the user's telephone number as shown in
[0048].

Silberberg does not specifically disclose automatically increasing, by said
payment system, said second authorized parking time by a residual authorized time
corresponding to said first authorized parking time linked to said first payment identified
by said received extending code, however, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-66
that upon reinsertion of the parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the
networked computerized parking system credits the parking charge card with the
unused amount of parking fee, and identification information of the parking charge card
is transferred to the central database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge
card into the card insertion opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is
added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card, and the
identification information is checked to assure that any refund only goes back to the
parking charge card originally entered into the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of
the parking charge card entered for refund matches with the code of the parking charge
card originally entered for purchase of parking time. Amirpanahi also shows that the
central database computer 90 uses any remaining, unused parking time and the
appropriate parking rate to calculate the refund to and calculate and retain a new value
for the parking charge card in col. 12, lines 56-61. In col. 1, lines 36-40 Amirpanahi also
shows that is common to use cards for computerized parking meters which operate
without coins and to estimate a certain value to be deducted from a card in order to
compensate for the amount of time that the user will be using said parking space, which

further suggests that the new value for the parking charge card in Amirpanahi

compensates for a new amount of time that the user will use the space, where examiner

interprets the extending code related to the residual authorized time, and corresponding

to said first authorized parking time as the code of the parking charge card entered for

refund since it must be matched with the code of the parking charge card originally

entered for purchase of parking time in order for the unused amount of parking fee to be

added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card, so user can

ultimately use this new value for authorizing additional parking. It therefore would be

obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose

automatically increasing, by said payment system, said second authorized parking time

by a residual authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time linked

to said first payment identified by said received extending code.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to disclose automatically increasing, by said payment system, said

second authorized parking time by a residual authorized time corresponding to said first

authorized parking time linked to said first payment identified by said received extending

code with the motivation of showing that a user is capable of using residual time in the

form of remaining, unused parking time to extend parking time.

Neither Silberberg or Amirpanahi does not specifically disclose upon receiving

said second payment, said payment system receiving from said user said extending

code specific to said first payment; however, Chan discloses in col. 4, line 47-col. 4, line

42, shows a user inserting a pre-purchased account card to start the meter, calculation

of time paid for, and *as the user slides the card back*...the program directs the card

read/write unit to record an identifying code for the meter on the magnetic strip and to

amend the recorded monetary value to show the new balance, *if the user wishes to*

extend the parking period before the meter expires, the main control unit may extend

the time if the latter recordation of the identifying code for amending the recorded

monetary value is repeated, the time remaining is again taken into account and the

amount charged written back on the card is the additional amount charged. In this

case, examiner interprets that the second payment of the present invention is

suggested by the user sliding the card back, since upon sliding the card, a new balance

is identified, and it is shown that user repeats the action of sliding the card back when

extending the parking period, examiner further interprets the identifying code for

amending the recorded monetary value of Chan as representing the extending code of

the present invention.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to disclose upon receiving said second payment, said payment

system receiving from said user said extending code specific to said first payment with

the motivation of showing the variable use of the parking extending code.

As per claim 2, Silberberg discloses:

wherein the parking space is identified by a number and the user provides said

number during said second payment operation using the appropriate input and

processing means cooperating with said payment means, (Silberberg discloses that the

user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be

extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's

account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been

paid for in [0052], where a unique code printed on the parking meter and is inputted into

the user's telephone to relay that data to the central station as shown in [0047])

As per claim 3, Silberberg discloses:

wherein said parking space number is used to generate said specific code

specific to said first payment, (Silberberg discloses a payment option where the user

uses his telephone number to dial the central station and the users account number is

automatically deduced from the user's telephone number as shown in [0048]).

As per claim 4, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said second

authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only upon said first payment

being related to said parking space, however does disclose in [0052], that the user can

input a command by touching any key indicating that parking time should be extended

and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account

and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for.

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the

parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking

system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and

identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central

database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion

opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,

unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to

assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into

the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund

matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of

parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and

Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said second authorized parking time is increased by any

residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention for said second authorized parking time to be increased by any

residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space with the motivation

of showing that a user's is capable of using residual time to extend parking time.

As per claims 5, 6, 8 and 9, Silberberg foes not specifically disclose wherein said

first authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment

relates to said parking space corresponding to a given amount paid by a user is equal to

the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by an appropriate table of charges, and *any remaining authorized time*

corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space/ wherein

the authorized time is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related

to said first payment as defined by a table of charges and *any remaining authorized*

times corresponding to preceding authorized times relating to said parking space/

wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to

the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

the authorized time linked to said first payment, and any remaining authorized time

corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space of a

transaction preceding said first payment/wherein said second authorized parking time

after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time

directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time , and any

remaining authorized times corresponding to previous authorized times relating to said

parking space of transactions preceding said first payment, however does disclose in

[0052], that the user can input a command by touching any key indicating that parking

time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment

from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking

time has been paid for.

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 12, lines 32-56 that upon reinsertion of the

parking charge card into the magnetic strip reader the networked computerized parking

system credits the parking charge card with the unused amount of parking fee, and

identification information of the parking charge card is transferred to the central

database computer 90 upon insertion of the parking charge card into the card insertion

opening 68 so that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining,

unused value of the parking charge card, and the identification information is checked to

assure that any refund only goes back to the parking charge card originally entered into

the card insertion opening 68, i.e the code of the parking charge card entered for refund

matches with the code of the parking charge card originally entered for purchase of

parking time. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and

Amirpanahi to disclose wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any

residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a

given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time

directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of

charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized*

time relating to said parking space/ wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater

of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table

of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized*

times relating to said parking space/ wherein said second authorized parking time after

the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly

related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any

remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first

payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized

time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein

said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the

greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in

particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said first payment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention for wherein said first authorized parking time is increased by any residual time only if said first payment relates to said parking space corresponding to a given amount paid by a user is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by an appropriate table of charges, and *any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space/* wherein the authorized time is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said first payment as defined by a table of charges and *any remaining authorized times corresponding to preceding authorized times relating to said parking space/* wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to the authorized time linked to said first payment, and any remaining authorized time corresponding to the previous authorized time relating to said parking space of a transaction preceding said first payment/wherein said second authorized parking time after the user enters said code is equal to the greater of the following times: the time directly related to said payment, as defined in particular by a table of charges, plus any remaining authorized time corresponding to

said first authorized parking time , and any remaining authorized times corresponding to

previous authorized times relating to said parking space of transactions preceding said

first payment with the motivation of showing that a user's is capable of using residual

time to extend parking time.

As per claim 7, Silberberg discloses:

only the time directly related to said first payment as defined in particular by said

table of charges is communicated to the user, (Silberberg shows that a central controller

can telephone the user's mobile telephone and display a message indicating that

parking time is almost expired and asking for acknowledgment as to whether the meter

should be topped up for a further payment period up to one hour which will be the

maximum parking time allowed at that meter in [0027]).

As per claims 11, 12, Silberberg does not specifically disclose wherein said user

makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking

time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between

the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the

code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first

authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds

to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized

parking time , however does disclose the user will be presented with a display indicating

that parking time has almost expired and asked whether the user wishes to extend

parking time should that be possible. The user can input a command by touching any

key indicating that parking time should be extended and the central control station will deduct appropriate payment from the user's account and reactive the parking meter to show that additional parking time has been paid for in [0052].

However, Amirpanahi discloses in col. 11, lines 30-42 that information about an amount deposited and expiration time is stored in the mother board 12. After checking balance of the prepaid parking card and checking a card identifying code entered by the user, the mother board 12 determines whether the pointer 59 of the timer 6 should be moved to indicate amount of parking time desired to be purchased by the user, and also in col. 12, lines 32-56 shows that any unused amount of parking fee is added back to the remaining, unused value of the parking charge card. It therefore would be obvious to combine the teachings of Silberberg and Amirpanahi to disclose the following:

wherein said user makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein said user makes said second payment before an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between the second payment and the expiry time of the first authorized parking time/ wherein the code of said first payment is valid until an expiry of time of said first authorized parking time, and wherein the residual authorized parking time corresponds to the time between said second payment and the expiry time of said first authorized parking time.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to disclose the above limitations with the motivation of showing that

a user can extend his parking time prior to the original parking time expiring.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Akiba K Robinson-Boyce whose telephone number is

571-272-6734. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on 571-272-6708. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

•Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system, Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

A. R. B.
April, 22 2011

/Akiba K Robinson-Boyce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628